DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 005 HE 001 076

By-Vaughn, Harold A.
The U.S. Student Movement: A Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspective.
Syracuse Univ., N.Y.
Pub Date May 69
Note-36p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.90
Descriptors-*Activism, Democratic Values, *Higher Education, *Political Attitudes, Social Attitudes, *Student Attitudes, *Student Behavior, Student Reaction

Whereas past campus revolts in America were concerned with on-campus issues, the present student movement is political, and must be understood as such. Much of the student unrest has resulted from the belief of students that the system is not truly representative and unjustly excludes them from the decision-making process; normal political processes are not functioning; and the democratic process is too slow in bringing about urgently needed reform. Max Frankel, George Kennan, Seymour Lipset, Lewis Feuer, Robert Hutchins, Margaret Mead, and Pitrim Soroken have offered various interpretations of the causes and implications of student unrest. American student unrest is comparable to 19th century student movements in Russia and Germany, and to more current movements in France and other countries. Placed in historical and cross-cultural perspective, the US student movement appears less radical, less violent, and less extreme. Much of the conflict in American universities has focused on the role of the university in society. As an institution, however, the university must undertake the resolution of problems directly related to its educational and parietal role, and must minimize sources of conflict that are social and political in nature. The university's future depends upon the way it meets these challenges. (DS)

ED032005

THE U. S STUDENT MOVEMENT: A CROSS - CULTUPAL AND HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Harold A. Vaughn
Syracuse University
may 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 076

foreward

Although the purpose of this paper is to examine student unrest as a problem in higher education, the approach is more nearly historical and political. This approach is based upon two assumptions. First that student unrest represents a problem that can not be resolved by developing a set of responses to deal with each and every campus crisis. Second, if the problem is to be resolved, it must be examined in an historical and political context.

Some of the material presented on the pages that follow is of significance to the college president confronted with a campus disorder. However, the search here is for the long view and for long term approaches.

Student unrest in the United States has upset the time hallowed equilibrium of a growing number of American colleges and universities and is having a significant impact on all institutions and aspects of higher education. It raises issues that strike to the core of the university system itself. It compels a re-examinatioon of the university's basic structure, its relationships with other institutions, its legitimate and proper role in society, and the delicately balanced relationship between its purely intellectual and academic functions and the legitimate and necessary concern that members of the academic community, including students, have with respect to contemporary social and political issues.

Activities of student radicals are also effecting other processes and institutions. More than a campus problem, student unrest is a major public issue.* The issues also strike to the core of the American political and social system, challenging basic tenants of liberal democracy.

---

*The extent to which the activities of student radicals have become an issue at the federal level is illustrated by the U.S. Attorney General's May 1 "Law Day" speech in which he indicated that the federal government would use the 1968 Civil Rights Act as a basis for moving against campus disorders.

Campus unrest, in and of itself, is not a new problem for U. S. colleges and universities. Some observers of the campus scene have found solace in the knowledge that students attending colleges and universities in times past have on occassion engaged in violence as a means for attaining group goals. Until recently, however, campus revolts were primarily concerned with on-campus issues such as the quality of food served in the commons, compulsory attendance at chapel, or unreasonable academic demands, at least as judged by students.*

The current state of student unrest in the United States is more than a series of campus revolts. On-campus issues, many of great import to academic institutions, are among the concerns of student activists but the major concerns are societal in scope and the techniques are political. The student movement is a political movement and must be understood at the political level.

---

* The first recorded student revolt at Harvard College took place in the spring of 1766 over the butter served in the commons. One hundred and fifty-five students who participated in a demonstration and an "eat-out", taking their breakfast in town, were accused of traitorous behavior and required to sign a confession of "irregular and unconstitutional proceedings." As a footnote to history, the student leader of the revolt was Asa Dunbar, grandfather of Henry David Thoreau.

The major confrontations seem to be between student activists and their supporters, and the universities.* In some instances, students challenge the university because of grievances that relate directly to the nature of the institution in educational terms. In other instances the challenge is due to the perspective students have of a university's involvement in controversial quasi-educational and non-educational projects. In yet other instances, the challenge seems to emanate from a student view of the university as a microcosm of an "oppressive" - "repressive" - "racist" society. Elements of irrationality may also be present and in fact, all of these elements may be identified during a given outburst.

The student movement in the United States has characteristics in common with student movements of the past. One notes, for example, the German Burschenshaft organized at Jena in 1815, Giuseppe Mazzini and Young Italy, the Russian student movement during the later 19th and early 20th centuries, the pre-World War I Mlada Bosnia, the Chinese T'ung Meng Hui, and the entire history of student activism and higher education in Latin America.

---

* According to the U.S. Attorney General's office, during the current year (1968-1969), disorders have broken out on more than two hundred campuses, leading to approximately 2,300 arrests and property damages into the millions of dollars. However, the most dramatic, perhaps the most violent outburst as a result of the student movement was not on a campus but in the city of Chicago during the Democratic National Convention.

It is also useful to make a comparative study of the student movement on a contemporary cross-cultural basis. A look at student activities in Canada, Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Spain, China, Japan, the Soviet Union, Czechoslavakia, Poland, Hungary, the several Latin American states, and the list is by no means exhaustive, indicates that the U. S. has no monopoly on student unrest. It also indicates that the issues of concern to students are not necessarily bound to those emanating from the American dilemma.

There has been some tendency to view the student movement as part of an international conspiracy. Some statements have been made by public officials and other reporters implying that the "New Left" is funded by the Cuban or Chinese Communists or other subversive elements. There seems to be no hard data to support this kind of accusation. A statement made by Professor Marcuse seems a more realistic appraisal of its international dimension. He observed that it is an international movement that grew up and is developing without form.[1]

Students supported by intellectuals initiated the process that brought about an open challenge to the ruling powers in Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Mao Tse Tung's "Let a Hundred Flowers Grow" experement ended prematurely with Chinese universities in a state of near chaos. Students are also much involved in the current restiveness among intellectuals in the Soviet Union.

Student unrest in the United States has had some successes. Campus based anti-Vietnam activity has been a factor in forcing a reappraisal of the U. S. position. Students have been credited with contributing significantly to the withdrawal of President Johnson from the 1968 campaign and the projection of Senator Eugene McCarthy into serious contention. Students have also forced many universities to reconsider their role in relation to such quasi-political undertakings as weapons technology research, intelligence analyses, and ROTC programs. As a result of student pressure, some institutions have altered their procedures in relation to the needs and aspirations of black and other minority group students. Student activities have led some universities to consider academic reforms and a review of the role of the student in the university.

There is an amorphous and spontaneous character to the student movement in the United States, amorphous because it is indeed a movement. This amorphousness and spontaneity make delineation difficult. Included within the movement are black student groups, the Students for a Democratic Society, other activist student groupings, some of them of a highly transitory nature, forming suddenly and spontaneously around an issue or the result of some action, subsequently breaking apart perhaps its members to form again around some new nucleus.

The S.D.S. claims a dues paying student membership of 7,000 and 25,000 supporters.[2] With a student population of 7,000,000, the S.D.S.

represents approximately a tenth of a percent of the students in the United States. According to a Louis Harris poll, 100,000 students in the U. S. can be counted as activists.[3] This would be a little over one percent of the total student population.

If the amorphous nature of the student movement makes it difficult to define, its violent dimension makes comprehension difficult. Violence causes one's perspective to be emotional. The violent behavior of the student militant and his supporters, and the sometimes violent reaction, has radicalized campuses and polarized positions.

Understanding the willingness of students to employ or be a party to violence as a means to goal attainment is a prerequisite for understanding the nature of the student movement. Max Frankel writing the introduction for the Walker Report on violence in Chicago during the 1968 Democratic National Convention, commented on the violent nature of American society.[4]

> And now we have come violently to disagree about the natureof our violence in Vietnam or Dallas or Watts or Hiroshima. We seek the primitive within ourselves and bemoan the failure of affluence to civilize. Our young deplore the violence of the old and are tempted to use violence against them. The old deplore the ferocity of the young and are tempted to use violence to suppress them.

Student militants are tempted to turn to violence for political purposes if they believe that the system unjustly excludes them from the decision making process, the normal political processes are not functioning, or if the system itself is under attack. All of these factors seem to be present in the current situation. The published Cox Commission report contained this description of the political values and attitudes of student activists:[5]

> "Many of these idealists have developed with considerable sophistication the thesis that these flaws are endemic in the workings of American democracy. They argue that their form of pressure - direct action, confrontations, sit-ins, and, in some cases, physical violence - applied at points of institutional weakness, is a legitimate political tool comparable to other forms of pressure - large political contributions, covert lobbying, favoritism, and the like - effectively applied by those who would lead society astray."

George Kennan, writing his rejoinder in Democracy and the Student Left, analyzed the two hundred odd letters he received from students and faculty members as a result of an article of his published in the New York Times Magazine, "Rebels Without a Cause."[6] He concluded that the prevailing political attitude was a rejection of the normal electoral process. Positions, he felt, ranged from the traditional Marxist

concept of the political process as a facade, a vehicle of oppression in the hands of a ruling class, to milder forms of disillusionment with the democratic process. Kennan concluded that students resent their inability to vote, are frustrated because the system does not heed their demands, feel the democratic process is too slow in terms of bringing about urgently needed reforms, or that the system is not truly representative. He also identifies a fear of the majority, a belief that majorities oppress minority groups, to certain segments of the student left. He points out that this and the concomitant fear of power is a traditional conservative view, not normally attributed to an ideology of the left.

Research on the political attitudes and behavior of students demonstrates that students tend to reflect the political attitudes and values of their parents. The college may further liberalize students. There have been several attempts to relate political attitudes to such factors as child rearing practices but the results are not conclusive. Studies do support the thesis that a student's political attitudes tend to influence his academic and career interests. The more conservative students tend to enroll in business schools, or major in the hard sciences. The liberals tend to be attracted to the more intellectual professions, or careers with a strong social service orientation. The liberal student is, therefore, more inclined to be majoring in the humanities, sociology and other social sciences.[7]

The political behavior of students who consider themselves to be liberals has tended to be active as opposed to the conservative student whose behavior has been characterized by inactivity. The contention that students majoring in certain disciplines such as sociology are more apt to be activists because they have less work to do is given a very different twist by such studies.

The political behavior of students is influenced by other factors. A college campus is one of the few places where a large number of students are in assemblage in one place. Also, student culture is highly communicable. In accord with Max Weber's observation that political activity is dependent upon the extent to which it conflicts with job requirements, students are permitted a certain irresponsibility as regards their academic role.

The violent behavior of student militants is sometimes justified in terms of the moral value ascribed to the issues. Herbert Marcuse sees campus unrest within the context of a protest against established order, against the "immoral and illegal" war in Vietnam, American society's inequalities, injustices, aggresiveness and hypocrisy.[8]

> Such temporary violations of Law and Order must be judged in the light of the crimes against which they try to draw attention - the continued slaughter in Vietnam and the continued oppression of racial and national minorities. Compared with this normal daily violence which goes largely unpublished and unnoticed, the student protest is nonviolent.

In any movement, indeed in any human action, it is difficult to make clear distinctions among issues, causes and motives. The one tends to slide into the other or to become another thing, identification often reflecting the disciplinary perspective or simple prejudices of the observer. So it is with the student movement. There seems to be general agreement as to primary issues but motives and causes are more elusive.

George Kennan is of the opinion that the issues of themselves are inadequate to explain the attitudes and behavior of the student left in the United States. He suspects the existence of an inner need, a deeper motive, an inner discontent and distress. The Vietnam war and the draft he identifies as exacerbating factors. He suggests that today's students are products of affluent but insecure homes, lacking religious or philosophic strength, estranged from nature, suffering from tension causes by a disbalance of emotional and intellectual growth.

Seymour Lipset perceives student tensions as related to the growth of universities, a world-wide growth in enrollment, and an increased competitiveness within universities. He sees the underlying cause of the student movement in a contemporary crisis of authority and legitimacy. This crisis arises during a period of drastic social change when the members of the political elite are in dispute as to the proper course. He points to Cardinal Cushing's lament that the younger priests just won't listen. He sees the crisis as world-wide in scope with students in opposition to all power groups, not necessarily leftists, but anti system.

Lewis Feuer attributes the student movement, primarily, to generational conflict, conflict from which the United States had been relatively free. He develops the thesis that American society has been characterized by "generational equilibrium", a condition in which no generation feels that its energies and intelligence are being frustrated by the others. This circumstance, he suggests, accounts for the lack of any significant student movement during past periods of crisis in American history. That is, there was no student rebel movement as part of the American Revolution, no student abolitionist movement, no student movement concerned with the plight of the American negro prior to the very recent period, no student movement concerned with the welfare of the downtrodden during the Great Depression, and no student movement in response to discrimination against Jews, the spread of Fascism or the cause of peace after the second World War. During the 1930's a very few, most notably a small minority of students attending a few eastern schools identified themselves with communist ideology and other leftist causes. It was not, however, a movement.

Feuer attributes to student movements a certain duality of motivation, motives of youthful love on the one hand and the conflict of generations on the other. He searches into the psychological aspects of idealism. He concludes that of all social movements, those made up of students have been characterized by the highest ideals of selflessness, generosity, compassion and readiness for self-sacrifice. At the same time, student movements are most apt to arise in societies where the older generation possesses a disproportionate amount of power and prestige.[9]

Several issues have been nominated by the student movement. A categorization of these issues is useful but potentially distortive. They appear to fall into three general categories: (1) Issues directly related to the educational function and parietal role of the university. (2) Issues that are clearly political in which the university is not involved or in which the university may serve as a stand-in for the larger society. (3) Issues that fall between, quasi-political and quasi-educational, related to the perspective student activists may have the university's involvement in quasi-political activities or their view of the university as a legitimate vehicle for social change.

The thesis of this paper is primarily related to issues that fall under the latter two categories. The Vietnam war and the draft, and the

conflicts emanating from the poverty-minority group situation are currently paramount.* The more organized and extreme elements of the student movement tend to identify issues with a disenchantment with American society in general. A resolution adopted by the national council of Students for a Democratic Society during a December 1968 session is illustrative of this more extreme position.[10] The particular resolution used a quotation from Mao Tse Tung as a point of departure.

> ..... How should we judge whether a youth is a revolutionary? .... If today he integrates himself with the masses ... then he is a revolutionary. If tomorrow he ceases to do so or turns around to oppress the common people then he becomes a nonrevolutionary or a counter-revolutionary.

Several paragraphs and statements extracted from the resolution are quoted below. These excerpts have been selected in order to provide examples of the more extreme attitudes within the student movement rather than as typical examples.

> At this point in history, SDS is faced with its most crucial ideological decision, that of determining its direction with regards to the working class. At this time there must

---

* Lipset relates student interest in the Vietnam war and the generational issue. The young see it as an oppressive war, contrary to U. S. values and the principle of the self-determination. The older generation's experiences lead to a distrust and fear of the spread of communism.

be a realization on the part of many in our movement that students alone cannot and will not be able to bring about the downfall of capitalism, the system which is at the root of man's oppression.

..... The notion that we must remain simply an anti-imperialist student organization is no longer viable. The nature of our struggle is such that it necessitates an organization that is made up of youth and not just students, and that these youth become class conscious. This means that our struggles must be integrated into the struggles of working people.

..... A youth movement raises issues about a society in which it will be forced to live. It takes issues to the working class.

..... The ruling class recognizes the critical potential of young people. This is why they develop so many organizational forms to contain them. Many young people have rejected the integration process that the schools are supposed to serve and have broken with and begun to struggle against the "establishment."

..... We must view the university as a racist and imperialist institution which acts to oppress the working class and is the brain center of repression against the liberation struggles at home and around the world.

Because of the amorphous character of the student movement, it is difficult to feel confident of general descriptive statements. Yet, generalization is necessary. Margaret Mead views the student movement with sympathy, perhaps with considerable approval. She writes:[11]

> They feel, I believe, that the adult world lacks their experience of growing up with the new and extraordinary conditions of the post World War II

> world - with a nuclear capacity to destroy all life on this planet, a population explosion that threatens all our gains, a steadily deteriorating relationship between man and his natural environment, and a precarious and worsening relationship between the haves and have-nots, within countries and between countries..... This, I submit, is new, far from being a traditional type of student rebellion, it is a new, strange and challenging situation, sensitively responsive to the new state of the world.

The situation described by Professor Mead may be a valid description of some of the most serious matters with which a thinking man should be concerned. There is little indication that these are the paramount concerns of student activists. To some extent, yes. These issues may be a source of considerable anxiety and this anxiety has its effect on the current student generation. Max Frankel, to quote a second time from his introduction to the Walker report, made this observation:[12]

> ..... It is a conflict between the affluent and educated upper classes of American society who, together with the poorest classes, are demanding ever faster change and even wholesale upheavel, and the large body of middle-class Americans, newly prosperous or still striving, who fear the loss of what they have acquired or intend to achieve if the ways and priorities of life are to be seriously altered.

Professor Feuer suggests that the issues nominated by the student movement emanated from the motivational aspects of the movement. He describes the period of 1960, when the movement was emerging or re-emerging, as the issue-searching stage. At that time, by his theory, the

motivating force of generational conflict had not yet merged with the civil rights movement or the anti-war movement. Its primary concerns at that time were "syndicalist" - that is, student concerns as to their own well-being, the assembly line character of higher education and the irrelevance of knowledge imparted by the universities.

At any early stage student activities sought identification with Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolutionaries. The bearded revolutionary leading a band of student rebels against an unjust order represented the prototype of the revolutionary ideal. The emotional appeal of the Cuban student movement is illustrated by the following:[13]

> They had all volunteered to leave their homes and promising careers for three years to go to the mountains to teach children there the simple elements of basic education ..... Fidel Castro was speaking. He warned them of the difficulties they would face there, their isolation from all to which they had become accustomed in their lives, and the natural resistance they would find among the peasants to the new venture. He urged patience upon them and then thanked them for their sacrifice.

This interest in Castro proved to be temporary and was not sufficient to sustain the U. S. student movement. Contributing factors may have been the Cuban missile crisis, Cuba's entanglements with the Soviet Union and Communist China, or the inadequacy of a foreign identification as an energizing force.

The Negro student movement came into existance spontaneously with the "Greensboro-sit-in," and action undertaken February 1, 1960, by four

black students. This action inspired black students on Negro campuses across the South. Within two months there had been similar actions undertaken by other student on fifty-three Negro campuses for the purpose of abrogating discriminatory laws and restrictions.

The impact on the white student movement was rapid and the consequences were significant. Civil rights became the dominant issue of the student movement. Feuer suggests that its appeal was, at least in part, the clear conflict between good and evil and because it was the issue most embarrassing to the older generation.

By 1965, the student movement was shifting its emphasis from the civil rights issue to the Vietnam war. Student concern over the Vietnam issue includes an attempt to seek identity with the backward peoples and races in other nations and on other continents. Alienated from American life, the student left felt an affinity for other "anti-Americans."[16]

> Vietnam, of course, is the most organized and coherent of the self-determination movements, but the seemingly structureless riots in Watts heralded the beginnings of an organized buildup of Negro militance and even violence in this country..... The Chinese Communist party maintains that at this time the Negro struggle, like the Vietnamese, is a national struggle, and Mao Tse Tung has said, "In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle."

A few observers have compared the current student movement in the United States to the Russian student movement during the later decades of the nineteenth and the first several years of the twentieth centuries. In some respects, the Russian student movement is considered the prototype, the example par excellence, of all modern student movements. It is said that the combination of tragedy, idealism, despair, self-sacrifice, romanticism and violence better lends itself to the pen of a Dostoevski or a Chekov than the historian. Student, a poem written in 1968, serves to illustrate:[15]

He was born to an unhappy lot
He studied in a miserable school
But endured his young years' torment
For the living labor of science.
With year to year of life
His devotion to the people strengthened.
His thirst for the common liberation grew warmer
His thirst for a better common lot.

And persecuted by Czarist vengeance
And Boyars' fears,
He set out to wander,
For the peoples' call,
To cry out the cry to all the peasants
From East to West
"Assemble in friendly column
Stand bravely, brother behind brother,
To conquer for all the people
Their land and freedom."

He ended his life in this world
In the snowy Siberian camps.
No hypocrite, but all his life
Remained faithful to the struggle
Up to his last breath
He was telling in the midst of exile
Fight for all the people
For their own land and freedom.

Russian students of the 1870's and 1880's followed the most radical social and philosophical thinking of their day and undertook the task of reforming Russian society and, if necessary, overthrowing the Russian state. The noted anarchist, Peter Kropotkin, wrote of the students:[16]

> In every town of Russia..... small groups were formed for self-improvement and self-education. .....The aim of all that reading and discussion was to solve the great question which rose before them. In what way could they be useful to the masses? Gradually they came to the idea that the only way was to settle amongst the people, and to live the people's life.

University students were urged to, "....Abandon as soon as possible this doomed world, these universities and schools from which they are expelling you now and in which they have always endeavored to separate you from the people. To the people! There you will find your field, your life, your knowledge."

Accurate figures are not available. Out of a total student population of between seven thousand and eight thousand, between one and two thousand students, fifteen to twenty-five percent of all the university students in Russia, participated in a back-to-the-people movement. Young men and women, the sons and daughters of the Russian aristocracy, attempted to live and work among the lowest classes of society. They imitated peasants and workers in manner and dress. Peter Sorokin, later a professor of sociology at Harvard, wrote of this movement:[17]

> Their life was similar to that of the first missionaries of a new unorganized religious denomination regarded as "subversive" and persecuted by the well-established spiritual and political powers. Continuously hunted by the police, now and then having no shelter or other necessities, risking being fired upon at meetings they addressed, they lived a life as full of danger, hardship and martyrdom as that of the first apostles of Christianity.

A tragedy of this "back-to-the-people" movement was its rejection by the peasants and workers. Students were not infrequently turned over to the police. Sometimes they were killed. For a brief period in 1905 the student activists made common cause with the workers. In consort, the two groups brought about the first Soviet revolution.* The revolt was shortly and violently suppressed by Czarist police and the army.

By 1917, the revolutionary movement in Russia had come under the control of professionals. Student revolutionaries were regarded as unreliable and the dynamic of a student movement was considered to be incompatible with the class struggle. Of necessity elitist, a revolution of intellectuals could lead nowhere but to a dictatorship of the intellectuals.

Successive generations of Russian students became part of the movement. Court records, private correspondence, speeches and other public

---

* Students had been demanding a voice in the affairs of the universities. For a brief period a student Soviet controlled the university at St. Petersburg. The student concept of academic freedom proved to be a narrow one.

records help to analyze the character of the student movement. It appears to have been characterized by a fixation on martyrdom, a propensity for self-destruction, an exaltation of violence. Student extremists resorted to murder as the means to an end and seemed constantly involved in plots to assassinate the Czar.* The student movement is said to have spawned all of the leading revolutionaries in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution.

If the Russian student movement is the prototype, the German student movement that erupted early in the nineteenth century was the first. One identifies elements that are to reappear in Russia several decades later. Karl Follen, leader of the Burschenschaft founded at Jena in 1815, gave this kind of leadership to his followers:[18]

> It is cowardice to speak of legitimate means for the obtaining of liberty. Nobody has a right to keep liberty from us; and every means is justified against those who presume to do this. Rebellion, murder of tyrants, and all acts which in ordinary life are designated as crime, are legitimate means for the conquest of freedom.

A fellow student, Karl Sand, a member of the Burschenschaft, murdered

---

* Betran Wolfe in, Three Who Made a Revolution, describes the shock that reverberated through the university at St. Petersburg in 1887 as a result of the hanging by the state of a science student, Alexander Ulianov, and three others, for engaging in a bomb plot to commemorate the sixth anniversary of the assassination of Alexander II. According to Communist history, young Vladimir Ulianov received his copy of Marx's Das Kapital from the hands of the twenty-one year martyred Alexander. We know Vladimir Ulianov as Lenin.

a prominant public figure, judging his victim to be representative of the sins of the older generation. Sand was beheaded for his crime and achieved martyrdom among German studentry. According to some historians, the extremism and violence of the German student movement, particularly the reaction to the murder committed by Sand, was largely responsible for the defeat of the movement toward constitutionalism in Germany at that time.

Max Beer describes these students as the grandfathers of the Nazis. The German Studentenschaft that was formed in 1920 and developed in the 1930's was anti-Semitic, anti-liberal and anti-democratic. They led a purge against the "non-German spirit" in universities, burned books, harrassed professors whose views were unacceptable to them, assaulted Jewish students and professors, and demanded the dismissal of high school teachers and professors who were out of accord with the "German spirit."

The French crisis during the late spring of 1968 shook the French academic world and threatened to tear apart the whole fabric of French social and political life. Like the Russian students of 1905, for a very brief period, students joined forces with the workers.* They failed to produce a revolution but they brought about the dissolution of the National Assembly, the dismissal of two ministers, and came close to toppling the DeGaulle government.

---

* The alliance was very temporary. The goals of the two groups were not compatible and the workers soon rejected the student group.

The "battle of the Sorbonne" was the end result of a series of events now become a pattern of confrontation between students and authority. The institute of Nanterre was involved in a conflict with an extremist student group. The issues were in large part "syndicalist" with strong societal-political overtones. The leader of the left wing group at Nantere was Daniel Cohn-Bendict. He, for example, argued that the American industrial psychology and sociology taught by professors at Nantere were tools developed by the bourgeois for the purpose of maintaining their privileged position. The students were also demanding special financial allowances to be paid by the state, a voice in conducting the affairs of the universities, and other changes in the educational structure. A few of the demands seem extreme. One such was that examinations be held at gunpoint in accordance with the true nature of French society.

Officials at Nantere feared a clash between right and left wing student groups. To avoid a clash they closed the university buildings. The left wing group then marched to the Sorbonne. In an extraordinary move, officials at the Sorbonne called in the police. The resulting conflict was the catalyst that brought into being a full-fledged movement.

In modern times French students have identified both with the extreme left and the extreme right. During the nineteenth century the student movement's affinity was to the left, its history was violent, and its successes minimal. During the twentieth, to the Second World War, the movement tended to align itself with the extreme right. Student militants were attracted to Fascism. They employed techniques designed to polarize student opinion, demonstrations calculated to bring about police suppression, radicalizing French students, evoking sympathy, thereby attracting new members.

There was an awakening of idealism among students in France after World War II. For a time, the focus of this idealism took the form of opposition to the Algerian war. With the termination of the war, syndicalist issues tended to become of paramount concern but other kinds of issues have not been excluded.

Other student movements might be examined. The behavior of student groups in Hungary and Czechoslovakia would be particularly useful. Unfortunately, a continuation of this historical and cross-cultural study would require the dimensions of a book rather than a paper. What has been discussed thus far does provide a useful perspective.

Feuer concludes that the duality of motivation he identified in student movements, bears with it a duality of consequence. He feels that student movements during the past hundred and fifty years have

been characterized by ".....a higher ethic for social reconstruction, of altruism, and of generous emotion."[19]

> .....On the other hand, with all the uniformity of a sociological law, they have imposed on the political process a choice of means destructive both of self and of the goals which presumably were sought. Suicidalism and terrorism have both been invariably present in student movements.

Placed in historical and cross-cultural perspective, the U. S. student movement appears less radical, less violent, less extreme. It has characteristics in common with other student movements but there is a difference of degree, at least in its present stage of development. Nonetheless, the common elements are important. They include an impatience with the rate of change, altruism, idealism, elitism - the claim that the group possess a higher ethic, the identification with the most underprivileged group in society, a sense of alienation, a justification of means in terms of ends- Max Weber's Ethic of Absolute Ends as opposed to an ethic of responsibility, and a willingness to use violence.

Earlier in this paper an attempt was made to identify the quarrel that students have with the university. What followed was an effort to demonstrate that the greater part of that quarrel cannot be understood within the context of the traditional juxtaposition of students and universities. What must yet be understood is the peculiar and

privileged position universities have usually held in society, although their potentially "subversive" character has been recognized. Thomas Hobbes in the Behemouth made reference to the "Wooden Horse" nature of universities. At the time of the Meiji Restoration in Japan when the educational system was organized as a propaganda mechanism for legitimizing the emporer-system, the universities were permitted to engage in free inquiry. An effort was made to isolate the universities from the mainstream of Japanese life but their special position was maintained.

The Soviet Union resolved the same problem somewhat differently. Their universities are devoted solely to teaching - propaganda. University professors do not engage in research. Research, free inquiry, is conducted within special research institutes, unrelated to the university structures.

There is a second approach to this matter. One concept of the university, a kind of idealization of the learning process, would view the university in terms of a remoteness and withdrawal from the contemporary scene. Woodrow Wilson gave eloquent voice to this ideal.[20]

> I have had sight of the perfect place of learning in my thought; a free place, and a various, where no man could be and not know with how great a destiny knowledge had come into the world - itself a little world; but not perplexed, living with a singleness of aim not known without; the home of sagacious men, hardheaded and with a will to know, debators of the

> world's questions every day and used to the rough ways of democracy; and yet a place removed - calm Science seated there, recluse, ascetic, like a nun: not knowing the world passes, not caring, if the truth but come in answer to her prayer. A place where ideals are kept in heart in an air they can breathe; but no fool's paradise. A place where to hear the truth about the past and hold debate about the affairs of the present, with knowledge and without passion;.....

American universities are not normally thought of as "..like a nun, not knowing the world passes, not caring, if the truth but come in answer to her prayer." Most universities are much involved in the contemporary scene and have adopted an extensive public service function. Whether one perceives this as desirable or undesirable, depends largely on the view held as to the desirability of the service. A striking contrast to Woodrow Wilson's statement, is a paragraph in James Ridgeway's book, The Closed Corporation:[21]

> The idea that the university is a community of scholars is a myth. The professors are less interested in teaching students than in yanking the levers of their new combines so that these machines will grow bigger and go faster. The university has in large part been reduced to serving as banker-broker for the professors' outside interests. The charming elitism of the professors has long since given way to the greed of the social and political scientists whose manipulative theories aim only at political power. Meanwhile the undergraduate students lie in campus holding pens, while graduate apprentices read them stories. The stories are boring, and students turn to making their own "free universities" or spend their tiem hatching political revolutions on the outside.

Robert Hutchins, former Chancellor of the University of Chicago, suggests that the weaknesses of the university, those under current attack, are not new but that until recently, almost nobody cared. After the Second World War universities moved from the periphery of society to the center of the stage. From a hotbed of radicalism to, "....the central factory of the knowledge industry, which was to be the foundation of our future."

The second chapter of the Cox Commission report considered the problem of the university in relation to society. The report pointed out that one source of student unrest was the fact that universities have been and are in a transitional stage themselves.[22]

> The increasing complexity and sophistication of all aspects of the industrial and social order have enormously increased the demands upon universities to join in applying to practical uses the knowledge, skills and equipment they assemble. .....Universities as others have said, have become knowledge factories with much wider and possibly more powerful constituencies than the students whom they educate. At least some branches of the university, moreover, are attracting to their faculties a new type of academician - the man of action as well as intellect whose interest is not the pursuit of truth for its own sake but to shape society from a vantage point combining academic security, intellectual weapons, and political action.....
> .....When students see work being done at a university on the application of science to spreading death and destruction in Vietnam, but little evidence of similar work on eliminating poverty and racial injustice, they are naturally concerned about the decision-making process.*

---

* The decisions as to when, how, where, and to what uses knowledge shall be applied.

Solutions to the problems that emanate from the uncertainties and ambiguities surrounding the role of the university is not within the scope of this paper. What is relevant is the attack mounted by extremist students against universities in terms of the relationships that exist or ought to exist between educational institutions and the society of which they are a part. Universities are attacked both for undertaking certain "outside" activities and for not undertaking other actions for the purpose of bringing about social change.

Universities are extremely vulnerable to the tactics employed by militant students. It is difficult to identify a better illustration of thenihilistic impulse in the student movement. It may not be possible for the university to protect itself against such attacks without doing damage, perhaps irreparable damage, to those things which are being defended.

Returning to the three major categories of conflict between the universities and the students, the university must undertake the resolution of those problems directly related to its educational and parietal role. There must be a major effort to improve the quality of education and re-define the parietal responsibilities of the university. It would be arrogant to attempt a detailed statement here. One point, however, is in order. Attempts to include students in the formal decision making apparatus may not effectively open channels of communication or remove causes of conflict. Latin American students have had a major share of

such power for years and their universities have been in a constant state of unrest. The price that has been exacted on account of this turmoil is incalculable. The Free University of Berlin involved students in its power structure to a degree almost unheard of in Europe but did not thereby avoid conflict with student militants.

Universities must minimize sources of conflict that are social and political in nature. Chancellor Levy of the University of Chicago anticipates the development of independent research institutes. Such a proposal deserves careful consideration. It might also be desirable to consider establishing institutes outside the university where the university's intellectual talents could be applied to the resolution of social problems.

The university must be engaged in controversey but it must be intellectual controversey. As an institution, the university is one of the oldest, most successful, and highest of man's creations. It is being tested in this second half of the twentieth century as it has never been tested. It is a simple obversation but all our futures depend upon the way in which these challenges are met.

NOTES

1. Guardian, Independent Radical Newsweekly, November 23, 1968, interview of Prf. Marcuse by reporter Robert Allen on October 20, 1968, page 11.

2. Seymour M. Lipset, "American Student Activism in Comparative Perspective," Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program, U.S. Department of Labor.

3. Louis Harris Poll, published in the New York Times.

4. Walker Report, "Rights in Conflict," A Report Submitted to the National Commissions on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, page v.

5. Cox Commission Report, "Crisis at Columbia," Report of the Fact Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968, page 5.

6. George Kennan, "Democracy and the Student Left," Little Brown and Company, September 1968.

7. Lipset, op. cit., pages 27-29.

8. "When, if Ever, Do You Call in theCops?" New York Times Magazine, May 4, 1969, page 137.

9. Lewis S. Feuer, "The Conflict of Generations," Basic Books, Inc., pages 3-53.

10. Guardian, op. cit., January 18, 1969, page 7.

11. Margaret Mead, letter to Columbia Forum, Winter 1968, page 40.

12. Walker Report, op. cit., page viii.

13. David Horowitz, Student, New York, 1962, page 11.

14. Jerry Rubin, "October 15-16 and the VDC," VDC News, published by the Berkeley VDC, I, No. 4, October 11, 1961, quoted by Feuer, op.cit. page 416.

15. Nikolai Platnovich Ogarev, Student, first published in 1868.

16. Peter Kropotkin, "Memoirs of a Revolutionist" Boston, 1899, pages 301-302.

17. Pitrim Sorokin, "A Long Journey," New Haven 1963, pages 48-49, quoted in Feuer, op. cit. page 100.

18. Feuer, op. cit, page 61.

19. Feuer, ibid, page 5.

20. Woodrow Wilson, speech at Princeton Sesquicentennial, 1896.

21. James Ridgeway, "The Closed Corporation," New YOrk, 1969, page 193.

22. Cox Commission Report, op. cit., page 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program, "American Student Activism in Comparative Perspective," Address by Seymour M. Lipset.

Books

Cox Commission Report, "Crisis at Columbia," Report of the Fact Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968, Vintage Books, New York, 1968.

Feuer, Lewis S., "The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements," Basic Books, Inc., New York and London, 1969.

Horowitz, David, "Student" New York, 1962.

Kennan, George, F., "Democracy and the Student Left," Bantam Books, New York, 1968.

Kropotkin, Peter, "Memoirs of a Revolutionist," Boston, 1899.

Ridgeway, James, "The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis," Ballantine Books, New York 1968.

Sorokin, Pitrim, "A Long Journey," New Haven, 1963.

The Walker Report, "Rights in Conflict," A Report to the Naional Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Bantam Books, New York, 1968.

Wolfe, Bertran D., "Three Who Made a Revolution," Beacon Press, Boston, 1948.

Articles and Periodicals

Birnbaum, Norman, "The University Crisis," The Center Magazine, Vol. 2, No. 2, March 1969.

Center Symposium, The Center Magazine, Vol. II, No. 3, May 1969.

Columbia Forum Vol XI, No. 4, Winter 1968, "The Columbia Upheaval: An Exchange.

Fried, Albert, "Night Comes to Columbia," New Politics, Vol. VI, No. 3, June 1968.

Guardian: Independent Radical Newsweekly, New York, issues for November 23, November 30, and December 28, 1968; January 4, January 11, January 18 January 25, March 8 and March 15, 1969.

Greer, Edward, "The Public Interest University," Viet Report, January 1968.

Miles, Michael, "Whose University," The New Republic, April 12, 1969.

Spender, Stephen, "What the Rebellious Students Want," The New York Times Magazine, March 30, 1969.

"When if Ever, Do You Call in the Cops?", The New York Times Magazine, May 4, 1969.

Unpublished Material

Caranfil, Andrew, "World-Wide Aspects of the Student Movement: A Preliminary Report on a Continuing STudy of Student Movements."